



**METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
TEL 510.817.5700  
TDD/TTY 510.817.5769  
FAX 510.817.5848  
E-MAIL [info@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:info@mtc.ca.gov)  
WEB [www.mtc.ca.gov](http://www.mtc.ca.gov)

***Memorandum***

TO: Planning Committee

DATE: May 2, 2008

FR: Executive Director

W. I.

RE: **MTC Advisory Committees' Transportation 2035 Policy Priorities**

Members of all three MTC advisory committees — the multi-interest Advisory Council, the Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee, and the Minority Citizens Advisory Committee — met jointly each monthly from January through April to keep abreast of issues surrounding the Transportation 2035 Plan. Some of these meetings attracted nearly 35 advisors, and the discussions have been lively and informative.

Attached is a compilation of the key policy recommendations offered by your advisors for consideration as you weigh various Transportation 2035 investment trade-offs. The policy points were developed by the advisors at their joint workshops, and focus on investment categories they believe have not in the past received the level of investment that is warranted. They urge that these areas be given more prominence moving forward.

Below is a matrix that shows how the advisors' priorities align with five Transportation 2035 investment categories:

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Maintenance</b>	<b>Congestion Relief</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Access</b>	<b>Emission Reductions</b>
Transit Oriented Development (TOD)			X	X	X
Public Transit Performance				X	X
Universal Fare Structure				X	
Pedestrian Safety			X	X	X
Regional Accessible Taxi Ordinance				X	
Paratransit				X	
High-Occupancy Toll (HOT) Funds		X		X	

---

Steve Heminger

## ATTACHMENT A

### **MTC Advisory Committees' Transportation 2035 Policy Priorities To Present to MTC Commissioners**

From March and April 2008 Joint Advisor Workshops

As the development of the Transportation 2035 Plan moves toward the debate on investment trade-offs, members of all three MTC advisory committees — the multi-interest Advisory Council, the Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee, and the Minority Citizens Advisory Committee — offer these key policy recommendations for consideration by the Commission as it weighs various Transportation 2035 investment choices. The policy points focus on investment categories that have not in the past received the level of investment that is warranted. Advisors urge these areas be given more prominence moving forward.

#### **1. Transit Oriented Development (TOD)**

Support policies and practices to make Transit Oriented Developments (TODs) both accessible and affordable.

##### *Accessible TOD Town Home Developments*

- Cities and developers should plan for accessible TODs in future station area planning grants.
- All town home developments should require at least 10 percent of homes be inhabitable by persons with disabilities if MTC's TLC/HIP funding is sought to provide transportation improvements.
- All developments built should require accessible paths of travel within the developments and between the development and all nearby transit if additional MTC's TLC/HIP funding is sought to provide transportation improvements.

##### *Affordable TOD Developments*

- Because virtually every planned TOD is located within a community of concern, TOD projects using MTC discretionary dollars should be prioritized on the basis of their minimization of displacement and their potential for new businesses and opportunities within the community.
- An evaluation of the impact on the community should be done for each TOD, and negative impacts should be mitigated.
- In addition, at least 25% of the residential units surrounding the station area planning radius (1/2 mile radius) of proposed TODs in communities of concern should be affordable housing.

##### *Local jurisdictions should*

- Encourage developers to pay into a pool for street improvements, including ADA ramps
- Clearly define terms, including "TOD," to ensure standards are met across the region.

## **2. Public Transit Performance**

Support and augment ongoing policies and practices to improve the delivery [and performance] of public transit services, support “last-mile” options for transit riders, and develop a regional, coordinated seamless transit system that includes TransLink® as well as the following elements:

*Public Transit Schedule Information:* Prioritize at the regional level current and accurate general and schedule information at all bus stops for transit riders.

- Utilize technology to develop a real-time system or network that can disseminate information in an efficient, ubiquitously accessible manner (possibly through the use of cell phones).
- Establish minimum standards for posted print schedules
- Post information with connecting transit systems (and across county lines)

*Access to Transit:* In making investment decisions on public transportation projects, MTC should give priority to those projects that will close identifiable gaps in the transit system, such as those cited in the Lifeline program report. Communities of concern are reliant on transit for access to basic, everyday services, and improving access to mobility for transit dependent residents should be a regional priority.

*Coordinated service/route planning:* Support improved and coordinated service/route planning by transit operators, including more analysis of current and future travel needs and timing of schedules, and better coordination with educational institutions (including K-12) and major employment sites. To improve overall transit service planning, strategies identified in Community-Based Transportation Plans (coordinated by CMAs) should be coordinated with transit operator's Short Range Transit Plans.

*Transit Security:* Create a regional program to enhance safety and security for transit systems, including a variety of security strategies for riders/passengers and transit personnel at stations, stops and on-board vehicles.

## **3. Universal Fare Structure**

Create a universal transit fare structure for the Bay Area with all day unlimited use passes and a regionwide standard for extended transfers that includes the following items:

- a) a standardized means-based fare focused on income level;
- b) seamless integration of TransLink® cards with other EBT (electronic benefit transfer) systems;
- c) regional definitions and standardization of age thresholds for senior and youth fares.

#### **4. Pedestrian Safety**

Continue to support pedestrian safety programs and projects, including support of legislation to provide state standards for audible pedestrian signals. Prioritize funding based on the following measurable safety-oriented metrics:

- **Mobility:** Safe and inviting conditions on-board all transit modes.
- **Security:** Personal safety on and around a transit environment, including station facilities, sidewalks and parking areas.
- **Traffic:** Adequate protection, in the form of physical barriers, illumination and signage, in areas where motorized and non-motorized forms of mobility intersect.
- **Connectivity:** Seamlessly and safely link all transit modes at transfer points; provide information to direct and inform passengers about transit options, connections and schedules.
- **Accessibility:** Safe, unimpeded access to transit along a reasonable and identifiable accessible route.

#### **5. Regional Accessible Taxi Ordinance**

Develop a regional accessible taxi model ordinance for the region, requiring taxi companies to comply with a certain level of service, including service across county lines, for persons with disabilities and the frail elderly.

#### **6. Paratransit**

Develop funding to expand paratransit beyond the federal  $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile minimum limit, and include paratransit services in the TransLink® universal fare card.

#### **7. High-Occupancy Toll (HOT) Funds**

If HOT lanes are developed, MTC should adopt a policy related to the use of funds collected from HOT lanes. More discussion needs to occur as to what this policy should contain. One suggestion is to look at communities of concern with higher car usage than other communities of concern and reinvest funds in alternatives to the automobile into those communities (since they would be most likely to either reduce use of their car or incur higher cost to use their car due to negative HOT lane impacts).